

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

COSMOKEY SOLUTIONS GMBH & CO.)	
KG,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 18-1477 (JLH) (CJB)
)	
DUO SECURITY, INC. n/k/a DUO)	
SECURITY LLC and CISCO SYSTEMS,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a), Defendants Duo Security, Inc., n/k/a Duo Security LLC, and Cisco Systems, Inc. (collectively, "Defendants") move for summary judgment of no infringement and no joint infringement.

The grounds for this motion are set forth in Defendants' Opening Brief and the accompanying papers filed herewith.

MORRIS, NICHOLS, ARSHT & TUNNELL LLP

OF COUNSEL:

/s/ Jennifer Ying

Brian A. Rosenthal
Katherine Dominguez
Allen Kathir
Hyunjong Ryan Jin
Charlie Sim
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10166-0193
(212) 351-4000

Jennifer Ying (#5550)
Travis J. Murray (#6882)
1201 North Market Street
P.O. Box 1347
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 658-9200
jying@morrisnichols.com
tmurray@morrisnichols.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Duo Security LLC
f/k/a Duo Security, Inc. and Cisco Systems, Inc.*

Jaysen S. Chung
Julian Manasse-Boetani
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600
San Francisco, CA 94111-3715
(415) 393-8200

Nathaniel R. Scharn
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 1200
Irvine, CA 92612-4412
(949) 451-3800

February 14, 2025

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

COSMOKEY SOLUTIONS GMBH & CO.)	
KG,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 18-1477 (JLH) (CJB)
)	
DUO SECURITY, INC. n/k/a DUO)	
SECURITY LLC and CISCO SYSTEMS,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having reviewed and considered Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, the related briefing, and all arguments thereto:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.
2. Final judgment of non-infringement as to claims 1–3, 5, and 8–12 of U.S. Patent No. 9,246,903 (“the ’903 Patent”) (the “Asserted Claims”) is entered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff, as follows:
 - a. Defendants do not infringe any of the Asserted Claims because Defendants’ Duo Push product lacks the claimed “authentication function” limitation; and
 - b. Defendants do not infringe any of the Asserted Claims because Defendants’ Duo Push product lacks the claimed “predetermined time relation” limitation.

3. Summary judgment of no joint infringement as to the Asserted Claims is entered in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiff, as Defendants do not practice the claimed method step of “transmitting a user identification from the terminal to a transaction partner” under any asserted theory of joint infringement.

SO ORDERED this _____ day of _____, 2025.

The Honorable Jennifer L. Hall
United States District Judge

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 14, 2025, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing to all registered participants.

I further certify that I caused copies of the foregoing document to be served on February 14, 2025, upon the following in the manner indicated:

David E. Moore, Esquire
Bindu A. Palapura, Esquire
Andrew M. Moshos, Esquire
POTTER, ANDERSON & CORROON LLP
Hercules Plaza, 6th Floor
1313 North Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Attorneys for Plaintiff

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Scott T. Weingaertner, Esquire
Stefan Mentzer, Esquire
John Padro, Esquire
Matthew Wisnieff, Esquire
Lauren Kuehn Pelletier, Esquire
Timothy Francis Keegan, Esquire
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
The New York Times Building
620 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10018
Attorneys for Plaintiff

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Farzad Feyzi, Esquire
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
601 Marshall Street
Redwood City, CA 94063
Attorneys for Plaintiff

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

/s/ Jennifer Ying

Jennifer Ying (#5550)